CANADA: A COUNTRY FOR ALL

THE REPORT OF

THE NOVA SCOTIA WORKING COMMITTEE

ON THE CONSTITUTION

Province of Nova Scotia

28th NOVEMBER, 1991

ERIC KIERANS, CHAIRMAN

92-01440/

Nova Scotia

Working Committee on the Constitution

6th Floor, Joseph Howe Building
1690 Hollis Street
PO Box 1617
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 2Y3

Phone: (902) 424-7088
Fax No: (902) 424-0546

November 28, 1991

His Honour
Honourable Lloyd R. Crouse, P.C.
Lieutenant Governor
Government House
1451 Barrington Street
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B3J 1Z2

Dear Sir:

On behalf of the Nova Scotia Working Committee on the Constitution, and in accordance with our mandate, I am pleased to enclose our final report.

Yours sincerely,

Eric Kierans

Eric Kierans
Chairman

Encl.

NOVA SCOTIA WORKING COMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION
MEMBERS

Eric Kierans	Chairman of the Committee, a former federal and provincial (Québec) cabinet minister, Halifax
Junior Bernard	Member of the Nova Scotia aboriginal community, Whycocomagh
Wanda Thomas Bernard	Social Worker and Professor, Maritime School of Social Work, and Past President of the Association of Black Social Workers, Dartmouth
Dr. Donald Campbell	Past President of Xavier College and University College of Cape Breton; Chairman, Centre Bras D'or, Sydney
Rev. Jim Chang	Pastor, First Baptist Church, Dartmouth
Yvon Deveau	Manager, Cheticamp Fish Cooperative, Cheticamp
Rick Laird	President, SCI Supplies and Services, Honourary Chairman, Ability Fund Campaign, 1991, Halifax
Marilyn Peers	Executive Director, Children's Aid Society of Halifax
Darlah Purdy	Member of the Women's Health Education Network, and co-editor of Vitality, Yarmouth
Laraine Singler	Administrator/Negotiator, Nova Scotia Government Employees Union, Halifax
Myrna Slater	President, Canadian Pensioners Concerned, and retired Professor of Nursing, Dalhousie University, Halifax
Brian Lee Crowley	Secretary to the Committee, Professor of Political Science, Dalhousie University, Dartmouth

Eric Kierans
Chairman

Junior Bernard

Rick Laird

Wanda Thomas Bernard

Marilyn Peers

Donald Campbell

Darlah Purdy

Rev. Jim Chang

Laraine Singler

Yvon Deveau

Myrna Slater

Brian Lee Crowley
Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	p. ii
	INTRODUCTION	p. iii
	SUMMARY OF THE REPORT'S CONCLUSIONS	p. viii
CHAPTER I	ABORIGINAL FIRST NATIONS: RECOGNIZING OUR FIRST CHAPTER	p. 1
CHAPTER II	CHARTER ISSUES: MAKING RIGHTS WORK	p. 8
CHAPTER III	REFORM OF OUR DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	p. 15
CHAPTER IV	QUÉBEC IN CANADA: PULLING TOGETHER	p. 19
CHAPTER V	CANADA: A COUNTRY FOR ALL	p. 24

* * * * *

	THE NEXT STEP	p. 33

APPENDICES

1.	COMMUNICATIONS	p. 37
2.	PRESENTERS AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS	p. 41
3.	GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS WHO MADE SUBMISSIONS	p. 45
4.	SCHOOLS WHICH PARTICIPATED IN QUESTIONNAIRE	p. 51

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is to the people of Nova Scotia that we owe our first thanks. The knowledge, the intelligence and the depth of feeling that they put into their oral presentations, their written briefs and their other contacts with our Committee were an inexhaustibly rich vein of raw material for this report. The fact too that they participated in the numbers that they did testified to their concern and their sincerity regarding the problems facing Canada.

In addition to this, we owe many debts of gratitude to numerous groups and individuals. Since Committee members all took time from their work and other activities, we need to thank first of all the employers, schools, voluntary groups, families and others who so willingly took on the extra burden needed to free up our time. We also want to mention the support that we received from Lorraine MacCormac (Secretary/Receptionist), Carmen Moir (Special Advisor), Peter Spurway (Communications Officer) and Brian Robinson (Researcher) of the Committee Secretariat, Alastair Saunders and Darryl Eisan of Nova Scotia Intergovernmental Affairs, Miriam O'Brien of Policy Board and Duncan Moss of Information Services; they gave us invaluable assistance in our work. We were also aided by the expert advice of the six Advisory Committees on the Constitution which were named at the same time as our Committee.

For the public meetings themselves, we particularly wish to thank the staff of Hansard, our translators (French, Mi'kmaq and American Sign Language), our child care workers and all those people who work in the various facilities where we met Nova Scotians.

A special 'Thank You' to the print and electronic media, who have made an extra effort over these past few months to make people aware that our Committee wanted to hear from Nova Scotians and who also did so much to make what can be a difficult issue accessible to the public.

Finally, we give our thanks to the man who made it all work, Dr. Brian Lee Crowley, Secretary to the Committee and Executive Director of the entire operation. His administrative skills verged on the flawless, and in his dedication to the success of our mandate he worked impossible hours each day. He was truly the core of the enterprise.

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

Before anything else, I would ask the reader of this report to look at the list of members of the Nova Scotia Working Committee on the Constitution. Pause over each name. Ask yourself if you have ever seen a committee so representative of the Canadian mosaic.

They are not national names. They are not elected members of the House of Commons or the Legislative Assembly. But they are, each and every one, known for their activities in and myriad services to their communities. It is this that must have caught the attention of Nova Scotia's three political leaders -- Premier Don Cameron, Opposition Leader Vince MacLean, and NDP Leader Alexa McDonough -- when they formed the committee. In setting it up, they clearly showed that party politics had no place in constitutional discussions.

Nova Scotia's political leaders took a risk that has few, if any, precedents in Canadian history. It soon became clear, after the early meetings and the vigorous internal discussions, that the Committee itself was a microcosm of Canada. Close encounters between different ethno-cultural groups, the aboriginals, the disabled and women's organizations forced us to learn about each other and quickly. It worked, but Nova Scotia's political leaders took a risk that has few, if any, precedents in Canadian history. This report is the work of that Committee, of people engaged in pastoral, educational and welfare work on both a full-time and voluntary basis. Their work on the Committee was voluntary as well.

Canada has evolved as a collective enterprise, fragile and at times uncertain of its role and, indeed, of its future. The vastness of our territory and the enormous possibilities inherent in the development of our lands and resources guaranteed all the challenge and stimulation that an enterprising people could wish.

We did not and we do not believe in an isolated existence but neither do we need to go charging off in all directions looking for action. As a nation, we have more than enough to do at home. We have no need for Lebensraum and, if we are to ensure our people a better standard of living -- and this no other nation is going to do for us, -- we will have more than enough to do.

Canada is changing. Canadians had long thought of themselves as a nation united from sea to sea, of two founding nationalisms and many cultures, with goals that, in Sir John A.. Macdonald's words, "rise far higher than the mere accumulation of wealth." To think Canadian has always been to think from East to West. The Free Trade Agreement changed all that and turned Canada on its axis. Henceforth, Canadians will be looking and thinking from North to South.

This abrupt change of direction has made Canadians uneasy, our future more perilous and our dependence on our neighbours to the South much greater. The Working Committee heard the uncertainty everywhere. What will happen to our values, our institutions, our social goals? Will we have the means to finance our health, welfare and educational sectors at their present levels and the resources to improve them? Will we be able to maintain our national standards?

The first goal of any economy must be to care for the basic needs of all its citizens, to assure them a reasonable standard of living within a framework of equality and justice. In a country as extended as Canada, it was inevitable that there be an industrial centre strengthened by the resources and consumer markets of Eastern and Western Canada.

This was the purpose of the National Policy of 1879, which has led to the Canada that we know today. The economics of the country made the core great and wealthy. Politics then ensured that this abundance be shared with the rest of the nation by social programs, national standards, transfer payments and the principle of equalization.

Today, the centre of the nation is no longer a core but is itself a periphery in a continental market. Increasingly, the big decisions affecting us, economic and political, are being made outside our borders. Atlantic Canada is becoming the periphery of a periphery. Is anybody listening in Ottawa? Is anybody at home in Ottawa?

Nova Scotians are being told to think North and South, to expand markets in the American Northeast. This will inevitably weaken our ties with our sister provinces. If we import, for example, an increasing supply of our needs from abroad, what claim, moral or historical, would we have on Ontario to continue to finance transfer payments and equalization? This will not be the Canada that Nova Scotians bought in 1867. That Canada is splitting apart at its economic seams.

Since the Quebec Act of 1774, Québec has been recognized as fully distinct in language, culture and civil law. Suddenly we are fiddling with words to describe an age-old reality. Québec is no mere fragment of our nation, it lies at the very heart of Canada. Canadian history begins with Québec, and a Canada without Québec is unthinkable. Healing the breach between Québec and Canada must be a priority.

Nova Scotians are as annoyed as other Canadians with the political rolling of the dice, but they are much more concerned with the declining economy. For them, as the report makes clear, the fundamental malfunction is the increasing unemployment in Canada and declining rate of investment in the face of limited supplies and soaring inflation. How can there be scarcity of work when there is so much want and so many needs to be filled in our nation?

As Mr. Gordon MacLeod vigorously observed at the afternoon hearing in Sydney while commenting on Prime Minister Mulroney's travels, "For him to have the nerve to go down to California and say that he is going to kick-start the Russian economy, well, he had better get back here and kick-start this economy."

The Citizens' Forum attributed the uncertainty, hostility and despair that they encountered to a basic mistrust of political leadership and our political institutions. Nova Scotians wonder if Canadian politicians are in a position to provide effective public policy to meet our domestic needs and priorities.

The sign on the door reads that we are in the continental market now and that global competition demands that the growth of Canadian surpluses and investment resources be used to build mega corporations that are competitive on the world stage. Ottawa is telling Canadians that they are not competitive and that this means costs and sacrifices. A strange criticism to be made of a people that, over the generations, have earned a third of their national income in foreign markets.

The costs and sacrifices, Nova Scotians sense, will be in redistribution, equalization, national standards and security for all Canadians. If this is Ottawa's direction, Canada will no longer be the Canada that Nova Scotians applauded so vigorously in the Pearson sixties.

The report shows clearly that Nova Scotians will no longer tolerate the exclusion of women's groups, aboriginal nations, the disabled, ethno-cultural groups from constitution-making and economic policy formation. The exclusive process is dead and public participation will be mandatory from now on. All these groups will be heard in the years and elections ahead. Empowerment flowing from the Charter of Rights and Freedoms adds force to their efforts to make rights meaningful and our political institutions accountable.

Underneath all the certainty, worry and frustration of Nova Scotians is the sense that the federal government is not responsive to domestic issues nor is it listening to the demand for greater participation that is coming from aboriginal, disabled, ethnic and women's groups. The only groups that they appear to be listening to come from an expansionist corporate sector.

In fact, public policy in Canada follows the Reagan pattern that turns economic policy over to the free market--in effect, beyond politics, beyond equity and people's priorities, beyond state intervention and regulation. Growth and accumulation are a corporate fetish. They were supposed to eliminate poverty and unemployment and so the voters went along. In 1965, we produced $57 billion worth of goods and services; unemployment was approximately 4 per cent. This year we will produce more than $700 billion in goods and services and unemployment is above 10 per cent. So much for the promises.

Canada's two levels of government seem to be moving in different directions. Ottawa is in the forefront of the global thrust to a world economy. It does not seem to understand that you can only build a strong international position on a strong domestic economy and Canada's economy is weakening daily as more and more of our corporations slip quietly south.

Provincial governments are left to pick up the pieces of growing poverty and unemployment with dwindling resources and support from the federal government.

The next election will be the strangest in Canada's history.

REPORT OF THE NSWCC: SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

CHAPTER I

ABORIGINAL FIRST NATIONS: RECOGNIZING OUR FIRST CHAPTER

1. Nova Scotians feel that the way the Mi'kmaq and other aboriginals have been treated since the arrival of non- aboriginals in this country is a national disgrace for which we all bear a burden of guilt and responsibility. The role of governments at all levels in creating and perpetuating this situation was particularly singled out.

2. Nova Scotians believe that the time has come to reach an equitable negotiated settlement with aboriginals regarding their rights and status within Canada. Furthermore, Nova Scotians wish their government not merely to acquiesce in such a settlement, but to be a strong advocate for it.

3. Nova Scotians want aboriginal rights and rights to aboriginal self-government respected, and the promises made to aboriginal peoples in treaties honoured.

4. Nova Scotians feel that:

   a) as a first step, the inherent right of aboriginal peoples, including the Mi'kmaq, to aboriginal self-government should be entrenched in the Constitution;

   b) aboriginal people be given the opportunity to explain to the rest of Canada, through the constitutional process, what they mean by aboriginal self-government;

   c) the actual shape and technical detail of aboriginal self-government must then be defined in negotiations between aboriginal people and the existing governments in Canada, negotiations in which aboriginal people are full partners and in which they choose their own representatives;

   d) the negotiations must be brought to a successful conclusion in the shortest time possible;

   e) the results of these negotiations must be fully acceptable to aboriginal people for them to be valid;

   f) the results of these negotiations should be entrenched in the Constitution.

CHAPTER II

CHARTER ISSUES: MAKING RIGHTS WORK

1. Nova Scotians believe that freedom and the rights and responsibilities which underpin it are key elements in the set of values which binds us together as Canadians.

2. Nova Scotians oppose the inclusion of property rights in the Charter.

3. Nova Scotians are committed to multiculturalism as an essential element of the Canadian identity.

4. Nova Scotians are not satisfied with the way governments are enforcing and pursuing rights guaranteed to all Canadians under the Charter. Public opinion wants all Nova Scotians to be full participants in social and political life and it wants all levels of government to be at the forefront of the efforts to realize this. This includes greater emphasis on achieving equality and combatting racism.

5. Nova Scotians endorse the historic accommodation between English-speakers and French-speakers in Canada which constitutional bilingualism at the federal level represents.

6. Nova Scotians agree that every effort should be made by the provincial government to meet the full range of needs of the Acadian population in their own language.

7. Nova Scotians support more effort by government to promote and preserve the diverse linguistic and cultural heritage of Nova Scotians. In particular, greater efforts need to be made to preserve the Mi'kmaq language and to make all Nova Scotians aware, through the school curriculum, of the contribution of aboriginal and black people to Nova Scotia society.

8. Nova Scotians are divided on whether the notwithstanding clause has a place in the Charter. Given the depth and strength of feeling on both sides and the lack of a clear consensus, this is a subject which merits further study before any action is taken.

CHAPTER III

REFORM OF OUR DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1. Nova Scotians feel alienated from politics and feel that our institutions are not making politicians sufficiently responsive to public opinion.

2. Nova Scotians support changes to the Senate, but this support is divided into two camps: abolitionists and reformers.

3. Nova Scotians are nonetheless agreed on two points:

   a) the Senate in its current form is totally unacceptable;

   b) if there is to be Senate, its members must be elected, preferably by a method which would result in there being equal numbers of men and women in the Senate, and which would also make its membership more representative of the racial, linguistic and cultural diversity of the country.

4. Nova Scotians believe that the principal function of any reformed Senate should be to make heard in Ottawa the voices of the regions outside Central Canada, but there is no agreement that this means that all provinces must be represented by equal numbers of Senators.

5. Nova Scotians think that the Senate should have just enough power to make the voices of the Atlantic provinces, the West and the North clearly heard in Ottawa, but not enough to block or obstruct the effectiveness of responsible government based in the House of Commons. Nova Scotians want a strong federal government that can act decisively, but one that must hear what Nova Scotians think before it acts.

6. Nova Scotians support a reform of the way members are elected to the House of Commons along proportional representation lines in order to reduce the influence of Central Canada and to make the election of underrepresented groups easier.

7. Nova Scotians are determined to have genuine, open and continuing consultations on constitutional matters by government at all levels and they are determined that they be better informed at all times about what is being done and why.

CHAPTER IV

QUÉBEC IN CANADA: PULLING TOGETHER

1. Nova Scotians agree that Québec must be made a full participant in the Canadian federation. They want a strong Canada in which every part is a willing partner, and understand that that means reaching a negotiated settlement with Québec.

2. Nova Scotians understand that, of all the possible outcomes of our constitutional discussions, a break-up of the country is among the very worst.

3. Nova Scotians' deep and widespread commitment to a united Canada with Québec as a full partner will prevail over any misgivings they have over a negotiated settlement providing that the price of unity is not the fragmentation of the federation or the weakening of the federal government;

4. Nova Scotians find that, of the options available, the most acceptable is a constitutional recognition of Québec's distinct society, providing that:

a) it be defined in terms similar to those of the federal position paper (i.e. language, culture and civil law); and

b) the provinces remain as equal partners within Canada, recognizing that this requires the accommodation of differences.

5. Nova Scotians find clearly not acceptable any decentralization of powers which would reduce the ability of the federal government to meet the needs of all the provinces. Meeting Québec's distinct needs must not be a pretext for granting to all provinces powers to which they have no reasonable claim.

6. Nova Scotians believe that the obligation on all governments in the country to reach a negotiated settlement with Canada's aboriginal peoples applies as much to the Government of Québec as it does to Ottawa and to any other province.

7. Nova Scotians accept the need for a greater effort on the part of the province to meet the cultural, linguistic and educational needs of the Acadian and French-speaking population of the province, including a constitutional obligation to preserve and promote the Canadian linguistic duality.

CHAPTER V

CANADA: A COUNTRY FOR ALL

1. Nova Scotians want to make a positive contribution to making Québec feel a full, willing and contributing partner in Canada.

2. Nova Scotians want Canada to be more generous, more caring and more supportive of the poorer regions of the country. The people of this province also want greater efforts to be made to include all Canadians, of whatever sex, ethnic origin, race, disability, language, culture, religion, age, sexual orientation, social status or profession, in the mainstream of Canadian life.

3. Nova Scotians condemn in no uncertain terms the failure of the country to make any

real progress on the place of aboriginal peoples within Canada.

4. Nova Scotians want constitutional change to do nothing to weaken the federal government's ability to be a leading force in the economic, social and cultural development of the country. In particular they want a federal government capable of:

a) maintaining national unity;
b) strengthening the economy;
c) setting national standards;
d) achieving social equality;
e) redistributing the prosperity of Canadians.

5. Nova Scotians want our social programs to be preserved, protected and promoted across the country. No constitutional change which endangers these programs is acceptable.

6. Nova Scotians do not want to see any erosion of the federal government's current role in providing national social and economic programs with national objectives and standards. Nova Scotians want the federal spending power to remain undiminished respecting regional and personal or social disparities.

7. Nova Scotians understand and support the diversity and flexibility that federalism makes possible and they want their provincial government to be fully active in its areas of constitutional responsibility. They also want the province to have the resources necessary to promote actively and vigourously the interests of Nova Scotians.

8. Nova Scotians want the policy of equalization and efforts to reduce regional economic disparities to be intensified. At the very least this means strengthening Section 36 of the Constitution Act, 1982 to make the obligations on Ottawa and the provinces in this regard firmer and more explicit.

9. Nova Scotians want all governments to spare no effort in promoting long-term, sustainable economic growth here.

CHAPTER I

ABORIGINAL FIRST NATIONS: RECOGNIZING OUR FIRST CHAPTER

When I say we are the invisible people, I am talking about the contributions that the Mi'kmaq people have made to this country. I am talking about us being the first chapter in your history, no matter what colour you are, no matter what race you are, no matter what country your forefathers came from, we are your first chapter. Racism is caused by fear of the unknown. It is your responsibility, as well as mine and my generation's, to make us visible so that we do become known, to destroy that fear.

Will Basque, Smak'nis of the Mi'kmaq Grand Council, Eskasoni

As Nova Scotians, I think that whatever we are going to do, in terms of constitutional discussions, I would like my province to go as an advocate for the aboriginal people. Not as trying to find a way to keep them quiet, but to speak up for them. That is what I would like...that we be advocates for the aboriginal people.

Ian Austin, Stellarton/New Glasgow

In our view, it is both essential and sufficient for amendment of the Constitution Act to achieve four goals:

(1) recognition of the legal personality of those aboriginal nations and governments already acknowledged by treaty;

(2) limitation of the powers of the Federal and Provincial governments over aboriginal communities;

(3) immediate vesting of specific powers of self-government in aboriginal peoples, subject only to subsequent agreements with the Crown; and

(4) including aboriginal governments in national equalization formulas, without prejudicing other financial entitlements.

Written brief, Mi'kmaq Grand Council

The form of aboriginal self-government that would be most acceptable to aboriginal people is inherent self-government, as recognized in the treaties.

Germaine Gould, UCCB Student, Sydney

The aboriginal peoples of Canada are indeed our first chapter and yet all our efforts to build a strong and generous society in Canada have systematically excluded and marginalized aboriginal peoples. No one deserves the title of founding people more than the aboriginal people of Canada, yet perhaps no one's contribution to this country has been so regularly denied, downgraded and forgotten. It is therefore fitting that the Committee devote its first chapter to what Nova Scotians have to say about setting the historical record, and the Constitution, straight on the place of aboriginal peoples in Canada.

Throughout Nova Scotia the Committee heard time and time again that the people of this province feel that the way the Mi'kmaq and other aboriginals have been treated since the arrival of non-aboriginals in this country is a national disgrace for which we all bear a burden of guilt and responsibility. The deplorable role of governments in creating and perpetuating this situation was raised repeatedly. The time has come to put this right and this can only mean that the time has come to reach an equitable negotiated settlement with aboriginals regarding their rights and status within Canada. Furthermore, it is clear that Nova Scotians wish their government not merely to acquiesce in such a settlement, but to be a strong advocate for it. This does not mean that the province can or should speak in the place of aboriginal people; it does mean that the province should direct its every effort to making aboriginal self-government a reality.

This wide recognition of the moral claims of aboriginal peoples regarding treaty rights, and the right to aboriginal self-government is, in one sense, unqualified. Aboriginal rights exist, an inherent right to aboriginal self-government exists and treaties and other undertakings going back as far as the 18th century exist, such as Dummer's Treaty of 1725 and its ratification at Annapolis in 1726, the Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1752, the Royal Instructions of 1761, Belcher's Proclamation of 1762 and the Royal Proclamation of 1763. The people of Nova Scotia want these rights respected and these promises honoured. Nova Scotians are, for example, ready to recognize the Mi'kmaq people as a nation, as they are recognized in many of their historic international treaties. In

another sense, of course, there is uncertainty in the public mind about precisely what something like aboriginal self-government means. We live in a complex society made up of a web of established rights and institutions; adding into this mix a wholly new set of institutions and relations is bound to cause some concern and anxiety. On the other hand, there is a clear rejection of the traditional paternalism which has guided policy towards aboriginal peoples in this country. Throughout the Committee's work we heard constantly that if aboriginal people are to regain control over their own lives and build for themselves institutions that protect their values and promote their culture then they must define for themselves how that can best be done. Public opinion seems to feel, then, that:

1) as a first step, the inherent right of aboriginal peoples, including the Mi'kmaq, to aboriginal self-government should be entrenched in the Constitution;

2) aboriginal people must be given the opportunity to explain to the rest of Canada, through the constitutional process, what they mean by aboriginal self-government;

3) the actual shape and technical detail of aboriginal self-government must then be defined in negotiations between aboriginal people and the existing governments in Canada, negotiations in which aboriginal people are full partners and in which they choose their own representatives;

4) the negotiations must be brought to a successful conclusion in the shortest time possible;

5) the results of these negotiations must be fully acceptable to aboriginal people for them to be valid;

6) the results of these negotiations should be entrenched in the Constitution.

Anything less than this will fail to give to aboriginal peoples what Canada has always owed them: their recognition as the first nations of Canada. This recognition must bring with it the right of aboriginal peoples to send their own representatives to the constitutional table.

The Committee held public meetings on the reserves at Eskasoni and Shubenacadie and received submissions from several aboriginal organizations. This enabled us to hear a very great deal about the views of the Mi'kmaq people and their hopes and aspirations for the future. Given the history of relations between aboriginal and non-aboriginal Canadians, Committee members were impressed by the constructive and determined mood which prevailed in all our contacts with the aboriginal community of this province.

It is not the place of the Committee to define aboriginal self-government: it is not our mandate, nor do we possess the knowledge necessary. Much more important than either of these reasons, however, is a third reason already mentioned: only aboriginal people can speak for themselves on this issue; only aboriginal people know what they need to build their own political, judicial, economic, social and cultural institutions.

Whatever else aboriginal self-government may mean, we understood the Mi'kmaq representatives we heard to be saying that it must comprise the following elements:

1) A much stronger constitutional recognition of the scope and importance of aboriginal rights and treaty rights arising from treaties which in many cases long pre-date Confederation.

2) A recognition on the part of all governments in Canada, whether provincial or federal, that aboriginal political institutions are governments in the fullest sense of that word. This means, for example, that all relations between Ottawa or Halifax and the Mi'kmaq people must be government-to-government relations, a policy already being pursued by the Government

of Ontario vis-à-vis the aboriginal peoples of that province.

3) The abolition of the Indian Act, the transfer of most of the functions and resources of the present Department of Indian and Northern Affairs directly to aboriginal communities, with whatever is left of the Department to be under the control and direction of aboriginal persons. Aboriginal representatives repeatedly stressed, in this context, the importance of gaining control over their own educational system, together with the resources necessary. Education was recognized as the key to both preserving Mi'kmaq language and culture and improving the economic and employment prospects of aboriginal persons.

Again, the Committee cannot emphasize too strongly that this is in no way an attempt to define aboriginal self-government, but merely to report on what we heard.

Two non-constitutional points were raised in our discussions with aboriginal people, points which seemed to the Committee important because they represent possible gestures of good will and reconciliation which the non-aboriginal community in this province could make towards the Mi'kmaq people. The first of these concerns 1st October, which the Mi'kmaq celebrate as Treaty Day, in recognition of the treaties their people have signed with the governments of many countries in the course of the last 300 years, but especially of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship, signed at Halifax in 1752. Declaring Treaty Day a holiday for all Nova Scotians would be a mark of respect towards the aboriginal community of Nova Scotia, as well as a way for us to celebrate and emphasize the agreements which bind us all, aboriginal and non-aboriginal alike.

The second point which was raised concerns the coat of arms of the province of Nova Scotia. Many aboriginal people told us that they found offensive the way in which they are represented in the coat of arms and that this representation should be removed. As David Brooks, one of our presenters at Shubenacadie put it, "I find that this little logo

here shows a half-naked native with a couple of feathers on his head...he has got a stick or some kind of spear..., but the unicorn has got a Crown and chains and he has got more than the native person has. I find that this is kind of a derogatory sort of racism."

ABORIGINAL FIRST NATIONS: RECOGNIZING OUR FIRST CHAPTER

SUMMARY:

1. Nova Scotians feel that the way the Mi'kmaq and other aboriginals have been treated since the arrival of non-aboriginals in this country is a national disgrace for which we all bear a burden of guilt and responsibility. The role of governments at all levels in creating and perpetuating this situation was particularly singled out.

2. Nova Scotians believe that the time has come to reach an equitable negotiated settlement with aboriginals regarding their rights and status within Canada. Furthermore, Nova Scotians wish their government not merely to acquiesce in such a settlement, but to be a strong advocate for it.

3. Nova Scotians want aboriginal rights and rights to aboriginal self-government respected, and the promises made to aboriginal peoples in treaties honoured.

4. Nova Scotians feel that:

   a) as a first step, the inherent right of aboriginal peoples, including the Mi'kmaq, to aboriginal self-government should be entrenched in the Constitution;

   b) aboriginal people be given the opportunity to explain to the rest of Canada, through the constitutional process, what they mean by aboriginal self-government;

   c) the actual shape and technical detail of aboriginal self-government must then be defined in negotiations between aboriginal people and the existing governments in Canada, negotiations in which aboriginal people are full partners and in which they choose their own representatives;

   d) the negotiations must be brought to a successful conclusion in the shortest time possible;

   e) the results of these negotiations must be fully acceptable to aboriginal people for them to be valid;

   f) the results of these negotiations should be entrenched in the Constitution.

CHAPTER II

CHARTER ISSUES: MAKING RIGHTS WORK

> The Charter of Rights we consider to be a jewel of the Constitution and ... we look to that to gain empowerment in society as people with disabilities.
>
> Charlie MacDonald, Executive Director,
> Disabled Persons' Commission, Halifax

> Our concern is that although women's rights have been entrenched in the Charter, there really has not been the support systems to ensure that women's equality rights are being preserved.... When looking at these constitutional reforms, the government and its committees that are looking at it should not only be looking at the intent, but to ensure that there is something in place to back up that intent; to ensure that women's rights are protected; that the rights of minorities and native people are protected.
>
> Patti Munroe, Second Storey Women's Centre, Bridgewater

Perhaps no piece of legislation in the history of Canada enjoys such popularity and prestige as the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which was added to our Constitution in 1982. Freedom and the rights and responsibilities which underpin it are key elements in the set of values which Nova Scotians feel binds us together as Canadians.

PROPERTY RIGHTS

Reflecting their overall satisfaction with the Charter, no clear consensus emerged from our discussions with Nova Scotians on the need for any particular changes to it. This absence of agreement on change extends particularly to the proposal in the recent federal position paper (Shaping Canada's Future Together) for putting 'property rights' into the Charter. This particular proposal attracted more comment in our meetings and in the briefs we received than anything else in the federal paper. Many questions were raised

about how the presence of property rights in the Charter might affect individual rights and freedoms, efforts to protect the environment, aboriginal land claims and a host of other issues. There is, as a result, widespread opposition to property rights being added to the Charter.

MULTICULTURALISM

Nova Scotians endorsed the Constitution's recognition of the multicultural heritage of Canadians in the Charter (Section 27). The Committee found that Nova Scotians were committed to multiculturalism as an essential element of the Canadian identity and that they derived great satisfaction and pride from the openess to diversity which Canada's multiculturalism signals to the world.

At the same time, however, the Committee heard from many groups who felt that the promise of a more open all-inclusive society remained a mere promise, and that there was a great deal that needed to be done by governments to promote a multicultural reality in Canadian society.

ENFORCEMENT

Perhaps because they are so prepared to embrace not only a strong commitment to rights, but also a deep attachment to diversity, Nova Scotians do have one reservation about the Charter. That reservation is not about the content, but about its enforcement. The rights enshrined in the Charter represent ideals which Nova Scotians want to be not mere words on a page, but living realities. Many, however, are convinced that the right to equality guaranteed in Section 15 of the Charter, for instance, is an empty promise. It is true that the Charter only applies to the actions of government, and many of the sources of inequality in our society are therefore beyond the Charter's reach. The fact remains that governments, whether federal or provincial, have often failed to embrace the spirit of the commitment to equality which most Nova Scotians feel was placed in the Constitution in 1982.

Women, aboriginals, persons with disabilities, black Nova Scotians, ethno-cultural groups and Acadians, are among many groups whose members feel deeply and keenly the effects of inequality in our society. The promises of the Charter have not been fulfilled for them, as we in Nova Scotia know from the Marshall enquiry's revelations about Mi'kmaqs, black people and the justice system, as we know from the fight of Acadians for the French language schools guaranteed them under the Charter, as we know from the recent report of the Nova Scotia Advisory Committee on Race Relations and as we know from the report on single mothers on welfare in Nova Scotia, Women and Children Last. We live in a society in which inequality is created and sustained at least in part through the inexcusable neglect of governments.

One group which spoke out particularly forcefully on this subject was the Nova Scotia Provincial Alliance of Black Organizations. Black people are victims of racism in many forms, and the Alliance told us of the inadequacy of federal and provincial legislation to meet their needs. Human rights legislation is inadequate, for example, in protecting their equality rights. Furthermore, government policy generally fails to take the active role necessary to achieve equality of opportunity, whether it be in education, social services, employment, housing, or the myriad other fields in which government has the tools to move us so much closer to real equality. The indigenous black community also pointed out how inappropriate it is to address the problems of racism, as many governments do, under the heading of 'multiculturalism'. Black people have been living in and contributing to Nova Scotia society for over 300 years, and a policy designed to make easier the reception and integration of new arrivals is not the place to address their problems.

One of the most hopeful signs coming out of this Committee's hearings was the degree to which inequalities of all kinds were denounced not just by those who suffer from them, but by other Nova Scotians as well. Public opinion wants all Nova Scotians to be full participants in social and political life and it wants all levels of government to be at the

forefront of the efforts to realize this.

BILINGUALISM

Most of the constitutional protection for bilingualism, including the guarantee of access to publicly-funded official language minority schooling, is contained in Sections 16-23 of the Charter. Nova Scotians endorse this historic accommodation between English-speakers and French-speakers in Canada. With the exception of the educational provisions, however, bilingualism is not a requirement in most provinces. Outside Québec, New Brunswick and Manitoba, language policy in areas of provincial responsibility is entirely at the discretion of the provincial governments.

Nova Scotia has an important official language minority, and the question was frequently posed in the course of the Committee's work: what should be the position of the provincial government vis-à-vis its French-speaking population? We discovered a high degree of agreement between the Acadian and the English-speaking populations of the province on this question. All sides agreed that every effort should be made by the provincial government to meet the full range of needs of the Acadian population in their own language. Some improvement has been noted in social, health and educational services, but there is still a long way to go if Nova Scotia is to make its proper contribution as a full member of a country which has made a commitment to bilingualism. We were told that the best yardstick of progress for language minorities is whether they enjoy the level of support and services which the English-speaking community in Québec takes for granted. Judged by this standard, Nova Scotia's record is very poor indeed. Support for the extension of the full range of services to the French-speaking population was particularly strong among the young. A Canada enriched by the widespread use of the two major international languages of the world was the Canada they wanted in their future.

LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

While on the subject of language, the Committee wished to express how struck they were by the extent to which Nova Scotians made clear the deep connections which exist for them between language, culture and personal identity. The Committee felt that there was clear support for more effort by government to promote and preserve the diverse language heritage of Nova Scotians, particularly in the schools. Furthermore, instruction in the Mi'kmaq language should be offered as a matter of course, where numbers warrant, in schools attended by Mi'kmaq students, precisely because the preservation of Mi'kmaq culture must involve the preservation and promotion of the language.

In this same vein, the Committee was impressed by the presentation of the students of the East Hants Rural High School. These students told us that they and all Nova Scotians were being deprived of a knowledge of their heritage because of the neglect in our school curricula of Mi'kmaq contributions to our history, culture and society. This should be rectified as soon as possible, as should the similar neglect in our schools of the contribution of black people to Nova Scotia society. As one presenter in Dartmouth remarked, "Today, in Nova Scotia, our schools really do not tell the true story of the black people. It is not only the black people's history, it is our history, the history of Nova Scotia and the history of this country."

NOTWITHSTANDING CLAUSE

The only matter of clear controversy and disagreement with respect to the present content of the Charter is the override or 'notwithstanding clause'. Opinion is divided on whether such a clause has a place in a list of constitutionally protected rights. On the one hand we heard Nova Scotians argue that individual rights should have primacy over every other consideration and that the Supreme Court should have the final say in defining these rights. On the other side we heard that not judges, but elected officials should have the final say, because in a democracy we can remove politicians with whom

we disagree, but we cannot vote out judges. Given the depth and strength of feeling on both sides and the lack of a clear consensus, the Committee can only say that this is a subject which merits much more detailed study before any action is taken.

CHARTER ISSUES

SUMMARY:

1. Nova Scotians believe that freedom and the rights and responsibilities which underpin it are key elements in the set of values which binds us together as Canadians.

2. Nova Scotians oppose the inclusion of property rights in the Charter.

3. Nova Scotians are committed to multiculturalism as an essential element of the Canadian identity.

4. Nova Scotians are not satisfied with the way governments are enforcing and pursuing rights guaranteed to all Canadians under the Charter. Public opinion wants all Nova Scotians to be full participants in social and political life and it wants all levels of government to be at the forefront of the efforts to realize this. This includes greater emphasis on achieving equality and combatting racism.

5. Nova Scotians endorse the historic accommodation between English-speakers and French-speakers in Canada which constitutional bilingualism at the federal level represents.

6. Nova Scotians agree that every effort should be made by the provincial government to meet the full range of needs of the Acadian population in their own language.

7. Nova Scotians support more effort by government to promote and preserve the diverse linguistic and cultural heritage of Nova Scotians. In particular, greater efforts need to be made to preserve the Mi'kmaq language and to make all Nova Scotians aware, through the school curriculum, of the contribution of aboriginal and black people to Nova Scotia society.

8. Nova Scotians are divided on whether the notwithstanding clause has a place in the Charter. Given the depth and strength of feeling on both sides and the lack of a clear consensus, this is a subject which merits further study before any action is taken.

CHAPTER III

REFORM OF OUR DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There are all kinds of problems that are made worse by the imbalance in this country in political power between Central Canada and the regions.

Hugh McLean, businessman, Port Hawkesbury

I like the idea of a Senate. You know, they are our main people. But let them come out of the room, put out their cigars and come out in front of the people.

Greg Ross, high school student, Amherst

I think we should abolish the Senate. It is just a place where old politicians go to retire and make big bucks.... It does not serve any useful purpose.

Paul Jardine, Dartmouth

Nova Scotians feel alienated from politics and political parties and especially from our current political leaders. There is a mood of scepticism and a sense that our institutions are not making politicians sufficiently responsive to public opinion. While there may be agreement on the problem, however, there is a wide diversity of opinion on the best solution.

There is, for example, great support for changes to the Senate, but this support is divided into two camps: abolitionists and reformers. Many abolitionists feel strongly that there should be no Senate at all, whereas reformers do not agree amongst themselves on all the details of an acceptable reform. Similarly, while many abolitionists would prefer no Senate, there are reforms which would make a Senate more acceptable to them.

In this debate there are nonetheless two points on which there is a wide consensus:

1) the Senate in its current form is totally unacceptable;

2) if there is to be a Senate, its members must be elected.

We did not hear enough about the particular method of election to be able to gauge public opinion on this technical point. On the other hand, many groups and individuals argued forcefully for a method of electing Senators which would not only result in there being equal numbers of men and women in the Senate, but which would also make its membership more representative of the racial, linguistic and cultural diversity of the country.

Once we move away from these two points, however, consensus rapidly declines among Senate reformers on the two other key elements of Senate reform: on what it should represent as an institution and the powers it should enjoy.

On the question of the institutional role of the Senate the most that can be said is this: its principal function should be to make heard in Ottawa the voices of the regions outside Central Canada. In this respect it is seen as a counterweight to the domination of the Commons by Ontario and Québec which results from representation by population. There is by no means agreement, however, that this means that all provinces must be represented by equal numbers of Senators. Nova Scotians seek equity in regional representation and are prepared to look at diverse schemes to accomplish this.

Regarding the powers of a reformed Senate, again one can only draw out of all the ideas we heard a common thread. That thread is that the Senate should have just enough power to make the voices of the Atlantic provinces, the West and the North clearly heard in Ottawa, but not enough to block or obstruct the effectiveness of responsible government based in the House of Commons. Nova Scotians want a strong federal government that can act decisively, but one that must hear what Nova Scotians think before it acts.

Many of the same reasons that make some sort of Senate reform attractive to a considerable part of public opinion applies also to the way that members are elected to the House of Commons. We encountered considerable support for a change to some sort of proportional representation system for elections to the Commons. This support was based in part on a sense that this too would lessen Central Canada's influence in the House of Commons and in part on the ground that such systems make the election of women and other underrepresented groups easier.

In the field of reforming our democratic institutions, scarcely any reform could be more important than that of involving the public as fully as possible in the constitutional reform process itself.

The Committee made every effort to gauge public opinion on different formulas for amending the Constitution, but largely without success. There is almost no public interest in the technical question of the merits of one amending formula versus another. On the other hand there is a widespread and strongly held view that the public must participate fully and effectively in any attempt to change the Constitution.

Many schemes were proposed to us to accomplish this. The most common is the use of the referendum, whether advisory or binding. Many objections were raised to this by others. Other schemes also enjoyed some support, such as constituent assemblies, compulsory public hearings at various stages of the amendment process and so forth.

On the whole, however, there was not a sufficiently large consensus on any particular participatory mechanism for the Committee to endorse it with confidence. There is no doubt, however, that the public is determined to have genuine, open and continuing consultations on constitutional matters by government at all levels and they are determined that they be better informed at all times about what is being done and why. If the commitment and openness are there on the part of government, then the formal process by which this is done seems to be of lesser importance.

REFORM OF OUR DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

SUMMARY:

1. Nova Scotians feel alienated from politics and feel that our institutions are not making politicians sufficiently responsive to public opinion.

2. Nova Scotians support changes to the Senate, but this support is divided into two camps: abolitionists and reformers.

3. Nova Scotians are nonetheless agreed on two points:

   a) the Senate in its current form is totally unacceptable;

   b) if there is to be a Senate, its members must be elected, preferably by a method which would result in there being equal numbers of men and women in the Senate, and which would also make its membership more representative of the racial, linguistic and cultural diversity of the country.

4. Nova Scotians believe that the principal function of any reformed Senate should be to make heard in Ottawa the voices of the regions outside Central Canada, but there is no agreement that this means that all provinces must be represented by equal numbers of Senators.

5. Nova Scotians think that the Senate should have just enough power to make the voices of the Atlantic provinces, the West and the North clearly heard in Ottawa, but not enough to block or obstruct the effectiveness of responsible government based in the House of Commons. Nova Scotians want a strong federal government that can act decisively, but one that must hear what Nova Scotians think before it acts.

6. Nova Scotians support a reform of the way members are elected to the House of Commons along proportional representation lines in order to reduce the influence of Central Canada and to make the election of underrepresented groups easier.

7. Nova Scotians are determined to have genuine, open and continuing consultations on constitutional matters by government at all levels and they are determined that they be better informed at all times about what is being done and why.

CHAPTER IV

QUÉBEC IN CANADA: PULLING TOGETHER

> We cannot survive with just French, we cannot survive with just English. It is going to take both Québec and the rest of Canada to pull the country together and make this Constitution strong and what it should be.
>
> Nancy Tarkka, Community College student, Dartmouth

> Nova Scotia should be in the forefront of the effort to keep the Province of Québec in Confederation.
>
> Gerry Fogarty, former broadcaster, Halifax

The Committee was impressed by how reasonable and pragmatic Nova Scotians are in their view of Québec's place in Canada.

Broad agreement exists that Québec must be made a full participant in the Canadian federation. Nova Scotians feel this because of their sense of fairness and the pressing need for national reconciliation. They also feel it for the practical reason that our progress as a country and a province is harmed when a vital and contributing part of the country feels that it has been excluded from the Constitution. Québec feels it has been so excluded and that the Constitution is illegitimate as a result. A Canada divided against itself is a weaker Canada: it is weaker politically, economically and internationally. Nova Scotians want a strong Canada in which every part is a willing partner, and understand that that means reaching a negotiated settlement with Québec.

Similarly, there is a widespread understanding that, of all the possible outcomes, a break-up of the country is among the worst. Québec is an essential part of what makes Canada what it is and many people said that if Québec left, whatever remained could scarcely be described as 'Canada'. The Atlantic region also has an obvious practical interest in maintaining national unity. Who knows what would become of many of the

things we value about Canada in the absence of that part of the country which links us to the rest? What would become of our national cultural institutions or our international economic standing? Could we depend on equalization and other transfer payments? What becomes of the fishery in the Gulf of Saint Lawrence when a new sovereign state stakes its claim there?

The Committee is under no illusions: any settlement likely to be accepted by the Government of Québec is going to be vocally and vigourously opposed by a part of public opinion. From what we heard it is clear, however, that Nova Scotians' deep and widespread commitment to a united Canada with Québec as a full partner will prevail at the end of the day. But it will only prevail if the price of unity is not the fragmentation of the federation or the weakening of the national government.

What we found was that the most acceptable of the options was a constitutional recognition of Québec's distinct society, provided that:

a) it be defined in terms similar to those of the federal position paper (i.e. language, culture and civil law); and

b) the provinces remain as equal partners within Canada, recognizing that this requires the accommodation of differences.

The strength of this solution lies primarily in the fact that it does not require a general weakening of the federal government but on the contrary could allow more freedom of movement for it because Québec's autonomy in areas crucial to its cultural survival would be guaranteed. A Québec which does not feel threatened in Canada can be an active and willing participant in the development of the country as a whole.

The first condition on the distinct society recognition arises from an oft-expressed fear about the distinct society clause in the Meech Lake Accord. People told the Committee

that distinct society in the Accord had been largely undefined and they felt that they did not know what it meant. On the other hand, there was broad recognition that what makes Québec distinct in fact is the language and culture of the majority and the civil law. People are more receptive to a constitutional recognition of distinct society when it is defined in this way, because this is what they recognize as being distinctive about Québec.

Support for distinct society drops when people think it is creating inequality amongst provinces; hence the need for the second condition. Distinct society is most acceptable when seen as an instance of the general principle that the special and unique needs of each province should be recognized and dealt with. Nova Scotians understand that being equal does not mean that we all must be treated identically, but rather in ways sensitive to our differences.

On the other hand, a solution which clearly is not acceptable to the population is any decentralization of powers which would reduce the ability of the federal government to meet the needs of all provinces. Meeting Québec's distinct needs must not be a pretext for granting to all provinces powers to which they have no reasonable claim. Canada must seek to meet the needs of all regions of the country, and to do so must retain the power and resources necessary.

If Québec is a distinct society within Canada, however, so too are our First Nations. Public opinion sees Québec's claims to a recognition of its distinct society, and the aboriginals' claim to a recognition of their right to self-government as similar claims to a right to self-determination. Public opinion recognizes an obligation on every government in the country to reach a negotiated settlement with Canada's aboriginal peoples; this applies as much to the Government of Québec as it does to Ottawa and to any other province.

The Acadian community supports the recognition of Québec's distinctiveness, a

distinctiveness based in part on the fact that Québec is the only province with a French language majority and an English language minority. Nova Scotians were quick to remind us, however, of the fact that part of Canada's distinctiveness arises from the fact of its English language majority and large French language minority. This minority is not limited to Québec, but is very much present in provinces like Nova Scotia. The Acadian community feels strongly that an obligation on Québec alone to promote its linguistic and cultural distinctiveness is not an adequate response to the needs of official language minorities across the country. Such an obligation should, therefore, be matched by a similar obligation on the federal government and the other provinces to promote this duality. A greater effort on the part of Nova Scotia to meet the cultural, linguistic and educational needs of the Acadian and French-speaking population of the province was actively supported by other groups as well. Educators, youth, business and many non-French-speaking individuals, for example, all saw important economic, cultural and other benefits flowing from a vibrant French-speaking community in Nova Scotia.

QUÉBEC IN CANADA: PULLING TOGETHER

SUMMARY:

1. Nova Scotians agree that Québec must be made a full participant in the Canadian federation. They want a strong Canada in which every part is a willing partner, and understand that that means reaching a negotiated settlement with Québec.

2. Nova Scotians understand that, of all the possible outcomes of our constitutional discussions, a break-up of the country is among the very worst.

3. Nova Scotians' deep and widespread commitment to a united Canada with Québec as a full partner will prevail over any misgivings they have over a negotiated settlement providing that the price of unity is not the fragmentation of the federation or the weakening of the federal government.

4. Nova Scotians find that, of the options available, the most acceptable is a constitutional recognition of Québec's distinct society, providing that:

   a) it be defined in terms similar to those of the federal position paper (i.e. language, culture and civil law); and

   b) the provinces remain as equal partners within Canada, recognizing that this requires the accommodation of differences.

5. Nova Scotians find clearly not acceptable any decentralization of powers which would reduce the ability of the federal government to meet the needs of all the provinces. Meeting Québec's distinct needs must not be a pretext for granting to all provinces powers to which they have no reasonable claim.

6. Nova Scotians believe that the obligation on all governments in the country to reach a negotiated settlement with Canada's aboriginal peoples applies as much to the Government of Québec as it does to Ottawa and to any other province.

7. Nova Scotians accept the need for a greater effort on the part of the province to meet the cultural, linguistic and educational needs of the Acadian and French-speaking population of the province, including a constitutional obligation to preserve and promote the Canadian linguistic duality.

CHAPTER V

CANADA: A COUNTRY FOR ALL

We would like to see a Canada that guarantees justice and equality for all, regardless if you are a male, female, rich or poor, tall or fat, black or white, regardless of the colour of your skin or the language that you speak. Canada must be a Canada for all, for we are all Canadians....I would just like to hope that when my daughter, who is almost two years old now, becomes of age that there will be a Canada in which she may live.

Martha Brown, nurse, Halifax

It seems to me that that is the basic test of...to what extent we are a country, even though we might have separate judicial systems, or separate governmental systems or different approaches. To me, that is the bottom line: whether we have a responsibility for each other, to provide each other with equal opportunity.

Anthony Scoggins, Port Hawkesbury

Would a weaker federal government be of benefit to Nova Scotia? Do our municipal and provincial governments have the tax bases or resources needed to take on or over current federal responsibilities? Could Nova Scotia do what is needed to maintain a Canadian standard of living in Nova Scotia in terms of job creation, income security, health, education and other human resources? The answers to these questions is, quite simply, no we couldn't.

Curtis Bird, President, Cumberland District Labour Council, Amherst

Nova Scotians are deeply attached to Canada, to a Canada whose evolution the people of this province have greatly affected for good since well before 1867. They are keenly aware and justly proud of the fact that without the efforts of Nova Scotians, there would have been no Canada at all on 1st July, 1867.

Together with this great affection for the country, however, we heard many Nova Scotians expressing a deep disquiet. The Canada which is so close to their hearts is threatened. It is threatened most obviously by tensions between Québec and the rest of the country, tensions that threaten to tear it apart. As we showed in Chapter IV, Nova Scotians told us they wanted to make a positive contribution to lessening and even resolving those tensions, so that Québec can feel a full, willing and contributing partner in this country.

The Canada so firmly anchored in the hearts and minds of Nova Scotians is, however, threatened in other ways as well. Nova Scotians spoke clearly and eloquently in defence of the sort of open society they want Canada to be, and charged our Committee with the responsibility of communicating their message loudly and clearly, not only to our political leaders in Halifax, but to Canadians everywhere.

Nova Scotians want Canada to be more generous, more caring and more supportive of the poorer regions of the country. The people of this province want greater efforts to be made to include all Canadians, of whatever sex, ethnic origin, race, disability, language, culture, religion, age, sexual orientation, social status or profession, in the mainstream of Canadian life. On the whole, Nova Scotians think that there has been movement on these fronts over the years. One great exception in their minds is the failure of the country to make any real progress on the place of aboriginal peoples within Canada, a failure which Nova Scotians condemn in no uncertain terms, as the Committee showed in Chapter I of this report.

What worries Nova Scotians most is that they feel that progress in a number of these fields has been stopped if not reversed in recent years. Blame for this state of affairs they lay squarely at the doorstep of their political leaders; the Committee was told repeatedly that politicians were disregarding the clear wishes of the public on policy matters. While these may not be properly 'constitutional' issues, time after time the Committee heard of the worries, the fear and the disquiet caused by cuts in rural postal service, in equalization

payments, in the CBC, in social and educational services, in VIA rail and elsewhere, not to mention the issue always looming large in the background of our exchanges with Nova Scotians: the decline of our economy generally and the rise in unemployment. This is not the Canada they have sought to build, and they do not recognize it as being in their image. Nova Scotians are ready to make important sacrifices to make a better country, but we often heard that the sacrifices are demanded too easily by government, that the burden of them falls unfairly and that the results are disappointing.

Naturally the views the public holds about the Constitution are shaped by this. If the Constitution is the basic law of the land, then Nova Scotians want it to make the fullest and most practical contribution possible to the values which they hold so firmly. Nova Scotians, like other Canadians, are not, by and large, experts on the technical aspects of the Constitution, nor do they always agree on how the Constitution can best be harnessed in the service of their values. But on the values themselves their message is unmistakable.

Throughout its public meetings and other contacts with the population, the Committee has tried to help to bring out this certainty on values and to place it in a constitutional context. Having done this for a number of particular themes in the earlier chapters, the Committee has chosen to conclude its report with an overview of the sort of Canada in which Nova Scotians told us they wanted to live. For convenience's sake, we have grouped what we heard Nova Scotians say in general about the Canada to which they aspire around three themes: Strong National Government; Social Programs; and Nova Scotia and Economic Development.

STRONG NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

Nova Scotians believe that they and all Canadians are well- served by a strong government in Ottawa and they want constitutional change to do nothing to weaken the federal government's ability to be a leading force in the economic, social and cultural development of the country.

In field after field, people told us of the key role that Ottawa plays in their lives. Cultural groups spoke of the importance of national cultural institutions like the CBC/Radio- Canada, the National Film Board, the National Gallery and the Canada Council in contributing to the development of Canadian culture. Acadians spoke of the importance of bilingual institutions and federal support for official language minority communities throughout the country. The fishing industry told us of the importance of a strong national authority to manage the competing claims of five provinces on the fish stocks in the East Coast fishery. People concerned about protecting our environment emphasized how many forms of pollution reach far beyond provincial boundaries and therefore require strong national regulation.

These key sectoral claims, however, are only examples of a broad and fundamental sense that what was needed in Canada was a strong national government capable of maintaining national unity, strengthening the economy, setting national standards and achieving social equality across the land. Part of this commitment to national unity and social equality is embodied in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which we discussed in Chapter III. What we wish to explore further here is Nova Scotians' firm view that hand in hand with the federal responsibilities already mentioned goes a responsibility for redistributing the prosperity of Canadians by maintaining social programs and reducing regional disparities.

SOCIAL PROGRAMS

Nova Scotians are of the view that our social programs must be preserved, protected and promoted across the country. This includes universal hospital and health coverage, unemployment insurance and all the rest of the net of programs which guarantees a level of assistance to all Canadians. Interest was also expressed in extending that net through changes like a guaranteed annual income. These efforts to achieve a degree of social equality are part of what Nova Scotians feel make us distinctly Canadian; they are part of the set of values that binds us together.

The Committee realizes that the question of how best to pursue this goal of social equality through the preservation, protection and promotion of national social programs is a matter of constitutional debate. Certainly we heard a number of solutions proposed. The labour movement, for example, strongly supported the notion of a non-enforceable constitutional commitment to maintaining certain levels of social programs, similar to the proposal of the Ontario government for a 'social charter'. Other people worried about the long-term fiscal and other consequences of such a change. These differences of detail aside, on the substance Nova Scotians were clear: no constitutional change which endangers these programs is acceptable.

NOVA SCOTIA AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

While Nova Scotians are unequivocal in their support of a strong federal government, that does not mean that they wish their provincial government to be weak. Nova Scotians understand and support the diversity and flexibility that federalism makes possible and they want their government to be fully active in its areas of constitutional responsibility. They also want it to have the resources necessary to promote actively and vigourously the interests of Nova Scotians.

On the other hand, the public is painfully aware of the constraints placed on Nova

Scotia and Nova Scotians by the uneven levels of economic development and activity across the country. Alone we cannot pay for the level of services to which we, as full and contributing members of the national community, should have access. We cannot do it now or in the foreseeable future.

Nova Scotians take no pleasure in being in this position of dependence. This long-established frustration is being complicated and compounded, however, by a new fear: that of a withdrawal of commitment by the wealthier regions of Canada to the less-well-off. Nova Scotians have a sense that Canada is founded on a series of understandings, understandings between regions, between language groups and between generations. The understanding that touches them most directly is this: that Canadians everywhere, whatever their level of economic development or productivity, have a claim to government services of a comparable standard. In the case of the 'have-not' provinces, this was to be made possible by transfers from the 'have' provinces. To Nova Scotians, this understanding appears to be breaking down.

On top of the loss of various services like VIA Rail and rural post offices already alluded to, Nova Scotians regard two trends with alarm. One is the increasing failure of equalization and transfer payments to meet our needs. The other is the redefinition of economic relationships within North America resulting from the Free Trade Agreement. At a time of painful economic change for the whole country, its most vulnerable parts seem to be asked to bear a disproportionate share of the burden. Moreover, with the disappearance of tariffs, the orientation of the economies of Ontario and Québec is ever more to the South rather than to the East and West. Thus, the powerful coupling of self-interest and generosity which equalization and other transfers represented for Central Canada appears to be coming unstuck.

It is not always easy to see how to relate some of these questions to the Constitution, for they seem to be questions rather of political will and ordinary policy. This is not the case, however, with efforts to reduce regional economic disparities or the policy of

equalization. That these are part of the 'bargain' of today's Confederation was already recognized in the 1982 constitutional changes with the addition of Section 36. But while equalization itself is protected as a principle in this section, no particular level of support is set out and this makes have-not provinces too vulnerable to the whims of Ottawa. Nova Scotians wish to see Section 36 strengthened to make the obligations on Ottawa and the provinces firmer and more explicit.

On the question of regional economic disparities per se, we heard diverse accounts of its causes and many schemes to remedy it. While there was little agreement on the specifics of how economic development in this region might be fostered by constitutional means in this region, there was one unmistakable consensus: that governments of all levels and all stripes should spare no effort in promoting long-term, sustainable economic growth here. Time and again we heard the view that this region's problems are first and foremost economic and not constitutional, although there was also wide recognition that settling our constitutional problems is a necessary first step towards effective national action to deal with our economic problems.

CANADA: A COUNTRY FOR ALL

SUMMARY:

1. Nova Scotians want to make a positive contribution to making Québec feel a full, willing and contributing partner in Canada.

2. Nova Scotians want Canada to be more generous, more caring and more supportive of the poorer regions of the country. The people of this province also want greater efforts to be made to include all Canadians, of whatever sex, ethnic origin, race, disability, language, culture, religion, age, sexual orientation, social status or profession, in the mainstream of Canadian life.

3. Nova Scotians condemn in no uncertain terms the failure of the country to make any real progress on the place of aboriginal peoples within Canada.

4. Nova Scotians want constitutional change to do nothing to weaken the federal government's ability to be a leading force in the economic, social and cultural development of the country. In particular they want a federal government capable of:

a) maintaining national unity;
b) strengthening the economy;
c) setting national standards;
d) achieving social equality;
e) redistributing the prosperity of Canadians.

5. Nova Scotians want our social programs to be preserved, protected and promoted across the country. No constitutional change which endangers these programs is acceptable.

6. Nova Scotians do not want to see any erosion of the federal government's current role in providing national social and economic programs with national objectives and standards. Nova Scotians want the federal spending power to remain undiminished respecting regional and personal or social disparities.

7. Nova Scotians understand and support the diversity and flexibility that federalism makes possible and they want their provincial government to be fully active in its areas of constitutional responsibility. They also want the province to have the resources necessary to promote actively and vigourously the interests of Nova Scotians.

8. Nova Scotians want the policy of equalization and efforts to reduce regional economic disparities to be intensified. At the very least this means strengthening Section

36 of the Constitution Act, 1982 to make the obligations on Ottawa and the provinces in this regard firmer and more explicit.

9. Nova Scotians want all governments to spare no effort in promoting long-term, sustainable economic growth here.

THE NEXT STEP

The government, in consultation with the leaders of the two opposition parties, gave this Committee a mandate to "identify the range of constitutional options which are most acceptable to Nova Scotians". In considering how best to accomplish this task, Committee members recognized their responsibility to reach out to the public as actively as possible. There was a clear need to inform people about the issues, to stimulate discussion and debate, and to engage with groups who are often left out of such consultations.

In pursuing these objectives Committee members have learned a great deal about public consultation on the Constitution over the past few months. Given that the public in Nova Scotia is demanding fuller and more effective consultations, some recommendations on the process for constitutional change are in order.

Nova Scotians told the Committee that they were satisfied with many aspects of the process in Nova Scotia. They were particularly impressed by the efforts made by all three of our political party leaders to put together a Committee which was in fact and in appearance widely representative of the diversity of the population of Nova Scotia. Many people regretted that the membership of our elected legislatures was so unrepresentative in comparison. This precedent is essential and should be generalized in future. It would, however, be appropriate to add a youth member.

On the other hand, the time available to carry out this public consultation was very short. This poses various difficulties for community and volunteer groups whose memberships are dispersed, who do not have paid staff, and who need considerable time to develop positions on such a complex topic. The Committee recommends that in future there be as much lead time as possible for the public to examine the issues and prepare their responses. As well, every effort should be made to expand the time available for the actual consultations.

Many community groups have meagre resources because they represent groups who are often marginalized in Canadian society, such as women, blacks, ethno-cultural groups and persons with disabilities. Specific provisions of the Constitution such as the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, or the division of powers have great significance in the everyday lives of many such groups, but the long history of neglect and of discrimination on the basis of race, gender, income level or ability has discouraged many people from trying to influence the decision- making process. It is therefore clear that exceptional efforts need to be made to include such groups in consultations.

Committee members were pleased to be able to offer their time as a contribution to national unity and to the well-being of the province. The participation of individual Committee members was limited to varying degrees, however, because they had to carry out this commitment on top of their other work responsibilities. Given the time required

for members to study the issues, to participate in the planning of the consultation and to consult intensively with the public in a wide range of settings, it would be preferable to have full-time Committee members.

The members of this Committee accepted a mandate that specified a public hearing format. Comparing both the attendance and the participation at our hearings with those organized by other similar committees across the country, the Nova Scotia effort was clearly one of the most successful. The Committee rapidly became aware, however, of the limits of public hearings as a way of reaching the public and hearing their views. It can be daunting for an individual to come to the microphone in a large community hall to speak to a large Committee. The subject appears complex and all eyes are on the speaker. Every word is recorded, and there may be challenging questions from Committee members.

The public meeting format can and should be supplemented in future with other forms of consultation. For example, the two meetings with Mi'kmaq communities were deemed to be very successful. The Committee came to the communities and met in a setting familiar to the Mi'kmaq people. Community leaders organized and conducted the meetings and the Committee was clearly there to listen and to enquire, but not to control the process. Similar efforts should be made to reach out to other groups in their own settings: Blacks, women, persons with disabilities, low income groups, working people and so on.

The members of this Committee agreed to help the three political party leaders in Nova Scotia find out what the public thought regarding a number of constitutional issues which are preoccupying those leaders. The Committee was also given the mandate to report on any other constitutional matters of concern to the public.

The discussion paper (Finding Common Ground) written by the government, in consultation with the leaders of the two opposition parties, was useful, but clearly insufficient in itself as a tool to help the Committee get a proper reading of public opinion. In future, the members of another such committee should be fully and directly involved in every aspect of the planning and execution of all the tools of consultation, whether they be discussion papers or anything else. Such tools should accommodate the various levels of understanding which exist in the population at large, and strive to be simple, clear and non-technical. They should also cover all the perspectives on constitutional questions.

The Committee is confident that the conclusions in this report accurately reflect what we heard from Nova Scotians. An effective process of public consultation, however, goes beyond the exchange of information and opinions. It encompasses a dialogue in which all participants are able to learn and perhaps to change their views, necessitating ongoing public education and discussion.

The Committee believes it has met the obligations of its mandate within the time it was given. The next step is properly for the government to become involved directly in

the ongoing process of public consultation as the constitutional debate continues to unfold. The role of government is to further the process of public education and debate on constitutional issues. Sufficient time and resources must be made available to enable the full participation of all communities of interest so that all groups in Nova Scotia society may become equal partners in constitutional change.

The Committee calls upon the government to take the next step.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

COMMUNICATIONS REPORT

From the time of its formation in early June 1991 the Nova Scotia Working Committee on the Constitution recognized that a comprehensive, inclusive communications strategy would be central to its efforts to reach as many Nova Scotians as possible.

The NSWCC attempted to make it as easy as possible for interested Nova Scotians to make their views known on constitutional issues through several avenues including public meetings; a toll free message line; a FAX number; written submissions; and questionnaires.

As well, members of the Committee made themselves available to meet with schools, service clubs and community groups throughout the province to exchange ideas on various constitutional options.

The NSWCC is very gratified by the response it received in that approximately 450,000 Nova Scotians were represented by presentations made to the NSWCC either at public meetings or through written submissions.

The NSWCC also received excellent co-operation from media outlets throughout Nova Scotia.

The following is a summary of the Nova Scotia Working Committee on the Constitution efforts.

Public Meetings

Fifteen public meetings were held in various centres throughout Nova Scotia.

A total of 951 people attended the public meetings. Of that number, 226 made presentations to the NSWCC.

At two of the public meetings, simultaneous translation in French was provided; at two others translation was provided in Mi'kmaq; at three others signing interpretation for the deaf was offered upon the advice of the Nova Scotia Society for the Hard of Hearing.

A short video presentation was produced outlining major constitutional issues. This video was used at the public meetings as a means of introducing the audience to the subject.

News Releases and News Conferences

July 23, 1991: News Release outlined the activities of the NSWCC at its first meeting held the previous day; outlined communications efforts; reinforced mandate.

August 12, 1991: News Conference introduced NSWCC members; discussed mandate; provided proposed public meetings schedule; announced various means by which Nova Scotians could voice their opinions.

August 12, 1991: News Release issued outlining communications strategy and proposed public meeting schedule.

September 4, 1991: News Release issued announcing expanded public meetings schedule.

September 9, 1991: News Conference provided the final schedule and format for the public meetings; outlined NSWCC's recent activities.

September 9, 1991: News Release issued outlining final schedule of dates, times and locations of public meetings.

October 23, 1991: News Release issued setting November 1 as deadline for submissions; reviewed methods for making submissions to NSWCC.

November 8, 1991: News Conference revealed numbers of Nova Scotians who had made their opinions known through various methods; Chairman expressed gratitude of NSWCC to people of Nova Scotia and media.

November 8, 1991: News Release outlined various statistics about Nova Scotians response to NSWCC consultation efforts.

Advertising

A total of 36 newspaper advertisements was placed in 30 publications throughout Nova Scotia announcing the dates, times and locations of the public meetings. (approximate circulation 300,000)

These advertisements also included the number for the toll free message line; the FAX line number and mailing address of the NSWCC.

The September issue of Maritime Telephone and Telegraph's "Exchange" publication endorsed the NSWCC's efforts, outlined the Committee's activities and told Nova Scotians how to make their opinions known. (approximate circulation 300,000 households)

The Fall 1991 issue of the Nova Scotia Power Corporation's "Current News" publication carried an article on the NSWCC outlining the mandate of the Committee and how Nova Scotians could make their opinions known. (approximate circulation 300,000 households)

Public Service Announcements detailing local public meetings were sent to every radio and television station in the province.

Discussion Paper

The Nova Scotia government discussion paper entitled "Finding Common Ground" was printed free of charge by virtually every major daily newspaper in the province. (approximate circulation 250,000 households)

An additional 100,000 copies of the discussion paper were distributed by the NSWCC through mailings, public meetings, schools and through each of the 200 Post Offices in the province.

Copies of the discussion paper were also distributed in French, large print, and braille. It was also made available on audio-cassette.

Questionnaires

The discussion paper included a questionnaire. A total of 1,168 questionnaires was filled out and returned to the NSWCC.

Written Communications

The Chairman sent 1,000 personally signed letters to all the individuals, community leaders and interested groups the NSWCC could identify, sending them the discussion paper, the public meetings schedule and inviting them to take part. They were also asked to pass the information on to other interested parties.

The Chairman wrote letters to all of the 58 newspapers in the province outlining the mandate of the NSWCC and asking for the newspaper's support of the NSWCC's efforts.

The Communications Officer wrote to each of the 80 media outlets in the province, advising them of the NSWCC; its mandate and his availability to provide information and updates as the Committee's work progressed.

School Projects

Classroom projects on the constitution took place in every school district in the province, involving nearly 100 schools (See Appendix IV).

A video presentation was produced and distributed to the schools to assist with their classroom projects.

Many classes participated in the public meetings.

Addresses by NSWCC Members

NSWCC members spoke before 12 meetings of various organizations to a total audience of approximately 1100.

Toll Free Message Line

A total of 210 calls were received on the toll free message line.

Written Submissions

A total of 116 written submissions was received by the NSWCC.

APPENDIX II
Presenters at NSWCC Public Meetings

Dartmouth, September 23, 1991

Mr. Windston Settle
Mr. Kevin MacLean
Mr. Craig Fry
Ms. Kim Smith
Ms. Nichola Wilson
Mr. Jim Isaac
Mr. Burpee
Dr. John Savage
Mr. Hugh MacLellan
Mr. Orillio Sablone
Mr. Pat Savage
Mr. MacLellan
Mr. Joe Morley
Ms. Barbara Till
Mr. Don Keith
Mr. Byrne Williams
Mr. Hugh MacLellan
Mr. Lauchlin Fredericks
Mr. Paul Jardine
Ms. Laura Arnold
Ms. Audrey Samms
Ms. Nancy Tarkka
Ms. Cathy Neilson
Mrs. E. Durling
Mr. Jack Rowe
Mr. Don Pyle
Ms. Joan Keith
Mr. Chris Elson
Mr. James Mellon
Dr. James Smith
Mr. Osborne
Mr. Rick Williams
Mr. Williams

Kentville, September 24, 1991

Mr. Burpee Fuller
Ms. Peggy Hope Simpson
Mr. Peter Harrison
Mr. Graham King
Mr. Harrison
Nicholle Bellefontaine
Mr. David Greener
Mr. Harry Cook
Mr. John Murphy
Ms. Jan MacKinnon
Ms. Ellen Mouratis
Ms. Valerie Rayfuse
Ms. Kathleen Holmes
Ms. Mary Dewolfe
Mr. John Jacobs
Ms. Leslie Brown
Mr. Don Fraser

Amherst, September 25, 1991

Ms. Kim Cail
Mr. Dick Rothschild
Mr. Bob Salter
Mr. Morris Haugg
Mr. Dan Corbett
Mr. Dick Beswick
Mr. Greg Ross
Mr. Stan Rodenizer
Mr. Lloyd Jackson
Mr. Curtis Bird
Ms. Barbara Jack
Ms. Mayda Fellini
Mr. Richard Hinners
Mr. Ben Fairbanks
Mr. Gerry Martin
Mr. Dick Beswick
Mr. Joe Chapman

Port Hawkesbury, September 30, 1991

M. Paul Comeau
Mr. Alan Bernard
Mr. Frank Fraser
Mr. Berkley Guthro
Mr. Anthony Scoggins
Mr. Thomas Kearsey
Mr. Gary Sampson
Mme. Monique Jarved
M. Michel deNoncourt
M. Robert Fougère
M. Ben Samson
Mr. Hugh McLean
M. Gabriel LeBlanc

Sydney, October 1, 1991

Mr. Bill English
Mr. James Guy
Mr. Stephen MacLean
Ms. Germaine Gould
Mr. Brian McIntosh
Mr. Kevin Little
Mr. Wesley Stubbert
Mr. Joey Donovan
Mr. Evo Dipierro
Mr. Walter MacKinnon
Mr. Gary Corsano
Mr. Evan Lloyd
Mr. Walter MacKinnon
Mr. Kevin Kierans
Mr. Evan Scott
Mr. Dan McRury
Mr. Don Morrison
Mr. Bruno Marcocchio
Mr. Charles M. Musial
Mr. Gerard J. Maxner
Mr. Arthur Harrier
Mr. Bruce McDonald
Mr. Stephen Carroll
Mr. Henry Bradford
Mr. Rafael Gomes Morales
Professor Bhaliea Naidu
Mr. Gary Corsano
Mr. Michael McPhee

Eskasoni Reserve, October 2, 1991

Mr. Will Basque
Ms. Rosie Basque
Mr. Albert Julian
Dr. Marie Battiste
Ms. Murdena Marshall
Ms. Belinda Bernard
Ms. Margaret Johnson

Halifax, October 7, 1991

Ms. Stella Lord
Mr. Charlie MacDonald
Mr. Ken Farguharson
Mr. Jonathan Stewart
Ms. Zilpha Linkletter
Ms. Irene Hilchie
Mr. Vincent Calderhead
Mr. Charlie MacDonald
Mr. Michael Munday
Mr. Gregory MacAskill
Ms. Carol Beatty
Mr. Andrew Terris
Mary Sparling
Mr. Jim Guild
Ms. Nancy Kehoe
Mr. Gerry Fogarty
Mr. Brian Young
Mr. Arthur Donahoe
Mr. Brian Miller
Mr. Michael MacLeod
Mr. Kenneth Wood

Mr. Kevin McSweeny
Dr. John Savage
Mr. Leonard Kitz
Ms. Monique McFarlane
Mr. Charles Phillips
Ms. Myrna O'Brien
Mr. David Stewart
Ms. Shelagh MacKenzie
Mr. Stewart Francis
Mr. Jeremy Akerman
Ms. Maxine Shepard
Mr. Les Holloway
Michael MacLeod
Mr. Morris Givner
Mr. George Hawkins
Mr. Michael Duda
Mr. Brian Davis
Ms. Martha Brown
Ms. Gloria Brasseau-Cheval
Ms. Doris Renee Hilder
Mr. Edwin Ruben

Shubenacadie Reserve, October 8, 1991

Ms. Sandy Maloney
Mr. Kevin Christmas
Mr. Scott Taylor
Mr. Colin Cruise
Chief Reg Maloney
Mr. Curtis Clarke

Mr. William Jenkins
Mr. Dave Brooks
Ms. Norma Bernard
Mr. Bernard Larussic
Mr. Frank Fawson
Mr. Fred Canavan

Stellarton/New Glasgow, October 9, 1991

Mr. Tom MacLean
Mr. Derrick Curley
Mr. Jack Blakeney
Mr. Scott Adamson
Mr. Charlie Sutherland
Mr. Everett Baudoux
Mr. Ian Austin
Ms. Eileen MacLeod

Mr. Everett Baudoux
Mr. Allan Gordon
Ms. Peggy Mahon
Mr. Geoff Brown
Mr. Doug Simpson
Mr. Gerry O'Pray
Mr. Joe Van Buskirk

Church Point/ Pointe-de-L'Église, October 15, 1991

M. Réal Boudreau
M. Léger Comeau
Mme. Murielle Comeau
Mr. James Crombie
M. Albert Gaudet
M. Paul Thimot
Mme. Marie-Adele Deveau
M. André-Éloi Thomas
M. Gilles LeBlanc
M. Ronald Bourgeois
M. Brian Empson
Mme. Lisa Deveau
M. Emile Dugas
Mme. Eileen Amirault
M. Ashley Manzer

Yarmouth, October 16, 1991

Mrs. Jeannie Tushaus
Ms. Christy Allen
Dr. Peter Loveridge
Mr. Ted Sollows
Mr. John Dyson
Mme. Pauline D'Entremont
Ms. Lynn Sitland
Ms. Patricia MacConnell
M. Maurice LeBlanc
M. Réal Boudreau

Bridgewater, October 17, 1991

Mr. Hugh Sproule
Ms. June McGinley
Mr. John Croft
Ms. Melinda Scott
Ms. Deanna Frankton
Mr. John Ross
Mr. Martin Rudy Haase
Dr. K.J. Ghandi
Mr. Rick Clarke
Mr. Robert Finck
Ms. Patti Munroe
Ms. Krysta Wambolt
Ms. Sarah Feltham
Mr. Douglas Rhodenizer
Mr. Larry Wark
Mr. Wylie Johnson
Ms. Irene Hilchie
Mr. Greg Blanchard

APPENDIX III

GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS WHO MADE SUBMISSIONS TO THE NSWCC

A. GROUPS WHO HAVE PRESENTED TO THE NSWCC (EITHER ORALLY AT HEARINGS, THROUGH WRITTEN BRIEFS, OR BOTH)

NAME	REPRESENTING
Affordable Housing Assoc. of N.S.	Housing
Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada	Language
Association des Acadiennes Acadians	Women
Canadian Auto Workers (NS)	Labour
Canadian Club of Halifax	Service
Canadian Congress for Learning Opportunities for Women	Women Education
Canadian Federation of Independent Business Atlantic Region	Small Business Industry
Canadian National Institute For the Blind (CNIB)	Disabled
Canadian Parents for French Youth	Education
Canadian Research Institute for Advancement of Women	Women
Canadian Union of Public Employees	Labour

Cape Breton Coalition for Environmental Protection	Environment Community Groups
Chrysalis House Shelter (Annapolis Valley)	Women Community Groups
Comité de Jeunesse d'Argyle Acadians	Youth Community Group
Comité des parents/profs. de Chéticamp	Acadians Education Community Group
Comité régional de Clare	Acadians Community Group
Comité régional d'Argyle	Acadians Community Group
Conseil culturel de la N.É.	Culture, Arts, Acadians
Conseil Jeunesse provincial Acadians	Youth
Co-op Atlantic	Co-operative Movement
Co-operative Housing Federation of Nova Scotia	Social Housing
Cumberland District Labour Council	Labour
Disabled Persons' Commission	Disabled
École Petit de Grat	Education Acadians Youth Community Group
Fédération acadienne (FANE)	Acadians

Fédération des parents Acadiens de la N.É.	Education Acadians
Festival Acadien	Acadians Community Group
Friends of the Dartmouth Common	Environment Community Group
Greenpeace	Environment
Halifax Board of Trade	Business Industry
Halifax/Dartmouth District Labour Council	Labour
Indian Brook Reserve Band Council	Aboriginals
Marine Workers Federation of N.S.	Labour
Metro Community Law Clinic	Law Community Group
Mi'kmaq Grand Council	Aboriginals
Municipality of the Co. of Cape Breton	Municipal
Municipality of the District East Hants	Municipal
Municipality of District of Uniacke	Municipal
National Action Committee on the Status of Women (NS)	Women
NS Advisory Council on the Status of Women	Women

NS Coalition on Arts and Culture	Culture Arts
NS Confederation of University Faculty Associations	Education
NS Federation of Labour	Labour
NS Gov't Employees Union	Labour
NS Gov't Retired Employees Assoc.	Seniors Labour
Pentz Elementary School (Bridgewater)	Youth Education
Provincial Alliance of Black Organizations	Black Nova Scotians
Royal Canadian Legion NS Command	Veterans Seniors
Seafood Producers Assoc. of N.S.	Fisheries Business Industry
Sobey's Inc.	Industry, Retail
Second Storey Women's Centre (Bridgewater)	Women Community Group
Students' Commission	Youth
Students of E.Hants Rural High School	Youth Education
Town of Liverpool	Municipal
Truro & District Labour Council	Labour
Union of Nova Scotia Indians	Aboriginals
Union of N.S. Municipalities	Municipal

Université Ste-Anne	Education Culture Acadians
Veterans Against Nuclear Arms	Veterans Peace Group Community Group
West Pictou Consolidated School	Youth Education
Women's Action Coalition of N.S	Women

B. INDIVIDUALS WHO MADE WRITTEN PRESENTATIONS TO THE NSWCC

Akerman, Jeremy, Halifax
Anderson, Chester, Malagash
Andrew, Arthur, Hon. Prof.,Halifax
Baudoux, E.L., DSO, DFC,O.St.J.,C.D., Merigomish
Bradford, Henry M., Marion Bridge
Bridgeo, W.A. Prof., Halifax
Carrier, N., Shelburne
Channon, Owen, Rev., Dartmouth
Cook, Harry, Kentville
Cornwall, Andrew, Windsor Junction
Cox, Douglas M., Bridgewater
Crombie, E.James, Ph.D., Pointe-de-l'Église
Davidson, Heather, Hantsport
DeMarco, Dr. T. Cheticamp
DiPierro, Evo, Cape Breton
Duda, Michael, Halifax
Eaton, Mr. & Mrs. Michael, Dartmouth
Empson, Bryan, Pointe-de-l'Église
Faulkner, Richmond S., Shubenacadie
Fogarty, Gerry, Halifax
Fraser, Rev. Peter D., Merigomish
Fuller, G.E.B., Avonport
Gandhi, Dr. K.J., Bridgewater
Godin, Normand, Pointe-de-l'Église

Gordon, Allan
Graham, Judson M., BA,B.Comm.,Dip.P.A., Halifax
Greene, Stephen, Halifax
Greenhavens, Elizabeth, Halifax
Haugg, Morris J., Q.C., Amherst
Hawkins, G.S., Halifax
Holbrook, G.W., Tantallon
Hudson, Sandy, Baddeck
Kitchen, Shirley
Ling, Blain, Truro
MacDonald, Dan R., Westville
MacLean, Jean L., North Sydney
MacLean, Stephen
MacNeil, J.S., Sydney
McCurdy, Peter, Chester
McLean, Hugh, Heatherton
Morley, Joseph A., Economy
Morse, William I., M.D., Mahone Bay
Naidu, Dr. S. Baliah, Prof., Sydney
Paratte, Prof. Henri-Dominique, Wolfville
Peers, Jim, Sydney
Pulsifer, Orville, Halifax
Rhodenizer, Stanley, Amherst
Ross, John H., Lunenburg
Rothschild, Richard E., Amherst
Salter, Robert W., Parrsboro
Savage, John, Dartmouth
Scott, Evan, Sydney
Settle, Winston, Stewiacke
Surette, Norman, Bridgewater
Terris, Andrew, Halifax
Thorton, Edward W., Truro
VanBuskirk, Joe, Stellarton
Vinci, Tom, Prof., Halifax
Wood, Frank N, Tantallon

APPENDIX IV

SCHOOLS WHICH ORGANIZED CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES ON THE CONSTITUTION

Annapolis Royal Regional Academy, Annapolis Royal
Bridgetown Regional Elementary School, Bridgetown
Lawrencetown Consolidated School, Lawrencetown, Annap. Co.
Riverview Rural High School, Sydney
Macdonald Complex, Dominion
Whitney Pier Memorial Junior High, Sydney
St. Anne's Elementary School, Glace Bay
Mount Carmel Elementary School, New Waterford
École Secondaire de Clare, Meteghan River
École Ste. Anne de Ruisseau, Ste. Anne de Ruisseau
Hants North Regional High School, Kennetcook
Cobequid Educational Center, Truro
Hants East Regional High School, Shubenacadie
Oxford Regional High, Oxford
Springhill Junior/Senior High School, Springhill
Dartmouth Education Center, Dartmouth
St. Peter's Junior High School, Dartmouth
Eric Graves Junior High School, Dartmouth
Bicentennial School, Dartmouth
Admiral Westphal Junior High School, Dartmouth
Dartmouth High School, Dartmouth
Prince Arthur Junior High School, Dartmouth
Ellenvale Junior High School, Dartmouth
John Martin Junior High School, Dartmouth
Prince Andrew High School, Dartmouth
Brookhouse School, Dartmouth
Shannon Park French Immersion, Dartmouth
Digby Elementary, Digby
Weymouth Consolidated School, Weymouth
Digby Regional High School, Digby
Islands Consolidated School, Freeport
Guysborough Municipal High School, Guysborough
Mulgrave Memorial School, Mulgrave
Canso High School, Canso
St. Mary's Rural High School, Sherbrooke
Halifax West High School, Halifax
J.L. Ilsley High School, Halifax
Queen Elizabeth High School, Halifax

St. Patricks High School, Halifax
Sackville High School, Lower Sackville, N.S.
Cole Harbour High School, Cole Harbour
Hants West Rural High School, Hants County
Windsor Regional High School, Windsor
Kentville Schools, Kentville
Whycocomagh Consolidated School, Whycocomagh
Margaree Forks District High, Margaree Forks
Straight Area Advanced Rec. Center, Port Hawkesbury
École NDA School, Cheticamp
Inverness Consolidated School, Inverness
Kingstec Community College, Kentville
Central Kings High School, Cambridge Station
Cornwallis District High, Canning
Horton High School, Wolfville
Western Kings District High School, Auburn
Pentz Elementary School, LeHave River
Parkview Education Center, Bridgewater
Lunenburg Junior/Senior High, Lunenburg
Memorial High School, Sydney Mines
Baddeck Rural High School, Baddeck
Rankin Memorial, Iona
Riverview High School, Coxheath
Stellarton High School, Stellarton
West Kings District High School, Auburn
East Pictou Rural High School, Pictou
West Pictou District High School, Pictou
South Queens Junior High School, Liverpool
École Petit de Grat, Petit de Grat
Barrington Municipal High School, Barrington Passage
Shelburne Regional High School, Shelburne
Milton Elementary School, Yarmouth
Maple Grove Education Center, Hebron
Yarmouth Junior High School, Yarmouth
Yarmouth Consolidated High School, Yarmouth